

The Patent office of the People's Republic Of China

Address: No. 6 XITUCHENG ROAD, JIMEN BRIDGE, Haidian District, BEIJING

Post Code: 100088

OCT 01 2003

PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE  
CHINA

Applicant: SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD.

ISSUING DATE:

Agent: Ya Li Shao

2003. 07. 04

Application No.: 01140876.6

Title: System and method for providing multimedia

**RECEIVED**

OCT 04 2003

Technology Center 2100

THE FIRST OFFICE ACTION

1.  The applicant filed a request for substantive examination on Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ according to Article 35 Paragraph 1 of the Patent Law. The examiner has conducted a substantive examination to the above-mentioned patent application.  
 According to Article 35 paragraph 2 of the Patent Law, Chinese Patent office decided on its own initiative to conduct a substantive examination to the above-mentioned patent application.
2.  The applicant requested to take  
 Year 01 Month 2 Day 19 on which an application is filed with the  patent office as the priority date.  
 Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ on which an application is filed with the \_\_\_\_\_ patent office as the priority date.  
 Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ on which an application is filed with the \_\_\_\_\_ patent office as the priority date.  
 The applicant has submitted the copy of the earliest application document certified by the competent authority of that country.  
 According to Article 30 of the Patent Law, if the applicant has not yet submitted the copy of the earliest application document certified by the competent authority of that country, the declaration for Priority shall be deemed not to have been made.  
 This application is a PCT application.
3.  The applicant submitted the amended document(s) on Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ and Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ after examination, \_\_\_\_\_ submitted on Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ is/are not accepted.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ submitted on Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_ is/are not accepted because the said amendment(s)  is/are not in conformity with Article 33 of the Patent Law.  
 is/are not in conformity with Rule 51 of the Implementing Regulations.  
 The concrete reason(s) for not accepting the amendment(s) is/are presented on the text of Office Action.
4.  The examination has been conducted based on the application text as originally filed.  
 The examination has been conducted based on the following text(s):  
 page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ of the specification, Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_, and figure(s) \_\_\_\_\_ in the original text of the application submitted on the filing day.  
 page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ of the specification, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_, and figure(s) \_\_\_\_\_ submitted on Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_  
 page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ of the specification, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_, and figure(s) \_\_\_\_\_ submitted on Year \_\_\_\_\_ Month \_\_\_\_\_ Day \_\_\_\_\_
5.  This notification was made without undergoing search.  
 This notification was made with undergoing search.  
 The following reference document(s) is/are cited: (the reference numeral(s) thereof will be used in the examination procedure hereafter)

**RECEIVED**

OCT 03 2003

Technology Center 2100

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

| NO. | Reference No. or Title   | Publishing Date |
|-----|--|-----------------|
| 1   | US 5809512A  | 1998. 9. 15     |
| 2   | A technical solution of a multimedia server in Computer Applications | 1999. 2. 24     |
| 3   |  |                 |
| 4   |  |                 |
| 5   |  |                 |

6. Concluding comments

on the specification:

- The contents of the application are in contrary to Article 5 of the Patent Law and therefore are not patentable.
- The contents of the application do not possess the practical applicability as prescribed in Paragraph 4 of Article 5 of the Patent Law.
- The specification is not in conformity with the provision of Paragraph 3 of Article 26 of the Patent Law.
- The presentation of the specification is not in conformity with the provision of Rule 18 of the Implementing Regulations.

on the claims:

- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ belong(s) to non-patentable subject matter as prescribed in Article 25 of the Patent law.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not comply with the definition of a patent as provided in Rule 2 paragraph 1 of the Implementing Regulations.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not possess novelty as requested by Article 22 paragraph 2 of the Patent Law.
- Claim(s) 1-9 \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not possess inventiveness as requested by Article 22 paragraph 3 of the Patent Law.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not possess practical applicability as requested by Article 22 paragraph 4 of the Patent Law.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not comply with the provision of Article 26 paragraph 4 of the Patent Law.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not comply with the provision of Article 31 paragraph 1 of the Patent Law.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not comply with provision of Rules 20 to 23 of the Implementing Regulations.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not comply with the provision of Article 9 of the Patent Law.
- Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ do(es) not comply with the provision of Rule 12 paragraph 1 of the Implementing Regulations.

The detailed analysis for the above concluding comments is presented on the text of this Office Action.

7. Based on the above concluding comments, the examiner is of the opinion that

The applicant should amend the application document(s) in accordance with the requirement as specified in the Office Action.

- The applicant should, in his observation, expound the patentability of the application of the application, amend the defects pointed out in the Office Action; or the application can hardly be approved.
- The examined deems that the application lacks substantive features to make it patentable. Therefore, the application will be rejected if no convincing reasons are provided to prove its patentability.

8. The applicant should pay attention to the following matters:

- (1) According to Article 37 of the Patent Law, the applicant is required to submit his observations within Four months upon receipt of this Office Action. If the time limit for making response is not met without any justified reason, the application to have been withdrawn.
- (2) The amendment(s) made by the applicant must meet the requirements of Article 33 of the Patent Law. The amended text should be in duplicate, its format should conform to the related confinement in the Guidance for Examination.
- (3) The applicant and/or the agent should not go to the Chinese Patent Office to interview the examiner without being invited.
- (4) The observation and/or the amended document(s) must be mailed or delivered to the Receiving Section of the Chinese Patent Office. No legal effect shall apply for any document(s) that not mailed to or reached the Receiving Section.

9. The text of this Office Action contains 3 page(s), and has the following attachment(s):

2 copies of the cited references, all together 5 pages.



Examination Dept. No. \_\_\_\_\_ Examiner \_\_\_\_\_ Seal of Examination Dept. for business only \_\_\_\_\_

(if the Office Action wasn't stamped by the specified seal, it has no legal effect)